

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 18, 19, 21, 22, 58, 61, 62 and 67 are currently amended. Claim 68 is newly presented. Claims 1, 5, 18 to 22, 55, 57 to 59 and 61 to 68 remain in this application. Claims 2 to 4, 6 to 17, 23 to 54, 56 and 60 are cancelled, without prejudice.

Claims 19 and 21 have been amended to improve clarity by inserting “and” before the second wherein clause. In claims 22, 58, 61 and 67, “gloss controlling agent” has been changed to “photoinitiator” or deleted.

Claim 68 has been added to clarify that the “second different concentration of the first photoinitiator” may be zero. Further support for the amendment is found in claim 60, which is dependent on claim 1 and requires the first and second regions to comprise a photoinitiator. By the doctrine of claim differentiation, claim 1 includes an embodiment where the concentration of the photoinitiator in the second region is zero.

In paragraph 5 on page 4 of the Office Action mailed June 29, 2006 (“the Office Action”), the Examiner states that claims “18, 21 and 58 to 61 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The closest prior art does not teach or suggest the recited surface covering further including a first or second region comprising photoinitiators.”

Claim 1 has been amended to require the top coat to have a first region with a first concentration of a first photoinitiator and a second region with a second different concentration of the first photoinitiator. Since the first and second regions have different concentrations of the photoinitiator, one the regions must comprise the photoinitiator. Therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable over the prior art.

Claims 5, 55, 57 to 59, 61 and 65 to 68 depend, directly or indirectly on claim 1.

Therefore, claims 5, 55 to 59, 61 and 68 are also allowable.

Claim 62, has been amended to require the top coat to have a first region with a photoinitiator. Therefore, amended claim 62 is allowable over the prior art.

Claims 18 to 22, 63 and 64 depend on claim 62. Therefore, claims 18 to 22, 63 and 64 are also allowable.

Attorney for Applicants respectfully maintains that all of the claims remaining in the application are in condition for allowance and requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in the application.

Respectfully submitted,

11/29/06  
Date

Douglas E. Winters  
Douglas E. Winters  
Reg. No. 29,990  
Attorney for Applicants

Armstrong World Industries, Inc.  
P.O. Box 3001  
Lancaster, PA 17604  
(717) 396-4070 (Telephone)  
(717) 396-6121 (Facsimile)

**Certificate of Mailing**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22231-1450 on:

11-29-06

Blenna K. Wilkey